



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

launching of his new yacht might do something to silence certain persons in this country who are forever nagging Germany and imputing bad motives to her, and show the American people that the Germans are not clandestinely seeking our hurt, or to supplant our legitimate place in the Western world or anywhere else. If this is true, the motive was a highly praiseworthy one. The Prince's mission in the other respects has proved a failure, to use the politician's phrase, because there was no such mission, so far as any one knows.

The visit of Prince Henry, summing the whole matter up, will do something to foster larger acquaintance, better understanding and more sympathetic and pacific relations between our country and his. But it will not do everything. Such ought not to be expected. It will do the work of one man and one visit, of one representative man, acting not only in his own behalf, but in behalf of the leaders of the nation. Beyond this we cannot expect it to be fruitful, unless it arouses many in both countries to follow it up with earnest and patient effort in the coming years.

The body of relations between our country and Germany is a very great one, the scope of which can by no possibility be covered by the influence of a few weeks' visitation by a single individual, like that of which we are speaking. There are political relations, commercial relations, social relations, educational and scientific relations, etc. In some of these temporary misunderstandings will arise; there will be apparent clashing of interests; selfish plans will be thwarted; national sensibilities will get hurt; irritation and friction will possibly arise. To keep the two nations steadfast in the bonds of a high friendship, such as ought forever to bind them together, in the midst of this great and growing complexity of relations, will require a good deal more than a whirling trip, a few receptions and banquet speeches, booming guns and squads of galloping horsemen, gaping and shouting crowds on the sidewalks, and the peppery sensationalism of the newspapers. It will call for the faithful efforts of all good men in both countries, from the Emperor and the President, from the ambassadors at Washington and Berlin, down to the humblest citizens. The two people must be brought to think sensibly and rationally of each other, and to see that their real interests are not antagonistic but common; that the moral, intellectual and material greatness of the one cannot but promote the progress of the other, if regarded in the right spirit.

The Prince's visit may easily be turned into a curse for both peoples rather than a blessing. This would require but a little wild and random talk. The imputation on this side of sinister motives in the Emperor, the belittling on the other by German newspapers of the Prince's reception here, if carried

a little further than they have already gone, might easily intensify the rivalry already existing, lead on to bitterness of feeling, to a real trade war, to colonial friction, and ultimately seriously endanger peace. If we expect the Germans not to be frightened by the "American danger" to their home markets, we must ourselves refuse to be alarmed at the "German danger" in South America. We have reached a moment in the progress of the relations of the two peoples demanding great wisdom, patience, fairness, and positive goodwill. By these only can serious misfortune be averted; with these, exercised steadily by individuals, by newspapers, by pulpits, by commercial organizations, by diplomats and political leaders in both lands, can lasting friendship and peace, with attending honor and manifold blessings, be easily promoted. There is not a single reason of any kind why the Prince's country and ours should not forever walk hand in hand in the work of enlightening and lifting the world.

---

### Funstonism.

Imperialistic militarism has gone to seed in General Funston. If this soldier had his way, it would likewise already have begun to bear its legitimate fruit in a most terrible way, and we should have gallows up in every prominent city in the land, on which to hang the men who have in the name of simple justice arraigned the government for its policy in the Philippine Islands.

General Funston has himself been rehearsing in this country in a picturesque way the story of the capture of Aguinaldo; but the account gains nothing in moral palatableness when retold in his cold-blooded, chuckling, half-profane way; in fact, it appears more loathsome than ever. He covers up nothing, apologizes for nothing, gives exultingly the details of the long tissue of lies, forgeries and deceptions by which the Filipino leader was captured, as if such trickery and falsehood were among the most imperative commands of the moral law. One wonders, when the story is finished, how a man with any remnants of conscience in him could possibly do such a thing; but even more sad is the fact that audiences of men and women here at home, — including ministers of the gospel on the platforms, — who have not gone through the brutalizing experiences of actual soldiering, could cheer and clap and laugh like mad over the conscienceless recital, with apparent gloating over every misfortune that has come to this unfortunate people whose confidence we have betrayed and whose long-cherished hope of independence we have crushed.

General Funston discusses Philippine matters of course wholly from the soldier's point of view, the point of view of the unthinking bayonet. To him everything is right which promotes the purpose for

which the army was sent out, the conquest and subjugation of the islands; everything wrong which opposes this and puts obstacles in the way of its accomplishment. He is not troubled with any qualms about the rightness of our determination to inflict our sovereignty on an unwilling people. The government has settled that for him. The will of the government is for him the supreme law, as it is for every man who adopts the military profession. Neither God in the conscience, nor the Sermon on the Mount, nor the Decalogue, nor the commonly-accepted standard of everyday morality has anything to say that is to him fit to be listened to. His ear is closed to them all; and if by chance any utterance of theirs forces itself into his consciousness, he is compelled by the god of might, to whom he has sworn allegiance, to brand it as traitorous.

It is from this point of view that one must look at some of the remarkable utterances which General Funston has been making. In his New York Lotus Club speech on March 8 he declared that it is perfectly proper for us to have all sorts of opinions about the holding of the Philippines,—as many opinions as there are islands, if we wish,—“but for heaven’s sake let us keep those opinions to ourselves until the sovereignty of the United States has been established over every square inch of those islands.” After that it will be “perfectly proper” for us, in his opinion, “to get together and pull hair and fight the thing out among ourselves.” He brands as traitors all those “misinformed and misguided” persons in the United States who have stood by the principles of Washington and Lincoln and opposed the course of the government, just as he brands as liars the five per cent. of the army in the Philippines who have had the conscience and the courage to write home, in private letters, of the killing of unarmed natives, of the water-cure torture and of the inspected prostitution which the officials both there and here have been so careful to keep out of sight. He “would rather see any one of these men hanged—hanged for treason, hanged for giving aid and comfort to the enemy—than see the humblest soldier in the United States army lying dead on the battlefield.”

Interpreted, this means that only one opinion is to be allowed to be heard, that of those who are in favor of forcing our sovereignty on the Filipinos. All who express a different opinion are fit subjects of hanging, and must have their mouths stopped. They may all speak after what seems to them a great political crime has been finished, but they must say nothing while it is in process.

This dictum of Funston is the expression of the very quintessence of tyranny, of the old-fashioned Torquemada kind. If the opinion were his alone, there would be no occasion to take it seriously. But unfortunately it is held just now by a considerable

portion of the people of the United States, many of whom are doubtless quite innocent of the real nature of the sentiment which they have allowed to possess them. It is therefore not to be regretted that this blunt soldier, a finished product of the policy in question, has been allowed to open his mouth and in his brutal, bullying way set forth what imperialism in its essence is, both abroad and at home. He has taken the sheep’s clothing off and revealed the animal in his native wildness.

General Funston evidently believes that, with the exception of a handful of “traitors,” the people of the nation are solidly with him and relish his denunciation of freedom of speech on this question. We can assure him, however, that he is mistaken, and that he will have had his pains for nothing. He came back from the East too late. His handful of “traitors” is multiplying into legions. The spell which has been upon the nation is beginning to break. The sober second thought has come, and the rest will follow in time. The people will go to the bottom of the whole sovereignty sophistry before they stop.

As to freedom of speech, it has been too dearly won to be crushed out again at this late day by Funstonian brutality. If all the anti-imperialistic leaders were hung into silence, as he would have them, millions of others—even from the ranks of the imperialists themselves, when they saw the legitimate fruit of their doctrine—would immediately take their places and die rather than give up the precious inheritance of freedom of speech, freedom to discuss in a frank and honest way at any time any policy of government. Free speech in the interests of right and humanity will never again disappear from our civilization, whatever may be the cost and the suffering necessary to maintain it. This is the one sure thing that has been made clear, both on this side of the water and on the other, during the last four dreadful imperialistic years, during which men, in numbers never known before, have stood up to say to the governments’ faces what they thought of the iniquities being committed. Opposition to war and its brutalities has for the first time in history got its full voice, and this will hereafter never again cease to be heard, however frightful may be the din of arms and the threats of martial despotism.

General Funston’s utterances ought to lead many people to think the subjects of militarism and imperialism through as they have not yet done. He is only a conspicuous specimen of the type of men and opinions and deeds which they produce when they go to their logical limits. Fortunately for the nation, they do not usually reach these limits. In most men of military stamp they are counteracted to a great extent by really humane principles and sentiments. General Funston personally can do little harm, even if the government allow him to speak

on in the reckless and indiscreet way which characterized his New York speech. It is the doctrine behind him, the system which has made him, in which lies the danger. This ought to be rooted up and cast out of the land. Every citizen who upholds it is responsible in his measure for Funstonism, with its cold-blooded truculence and intolerance, both at home and abroad.

### Editorial Notes.

**Painful and  
Suspicious Silence.**

In a recent number of *The Epworth Herald* we find the following admirably expressed criticism on the amazing difference of so many Christians to the peace question. It would be hard to put the case in a more truthful and accurate way, and at the same time with deeper feeling of its unfortunateness:

"There is a large number of people in every great nation who profess to be Christian. Real, ultimate Christianity is utterly opposed to war. Many of our wars are not the last resort of Christian patience, but the early resort of jingo politicians, commercial schemers, and military tyros. It is amazing that Christian people are so indifferent to the peace question. It is an unheard-of theme in most of our churches.

"During the last five years our church papers have been full of all sorts of articles on military characters and war. But it has not been our good fortune to see many on peace. There has been a painful and suspicious silence in nearly all our papers and pulpits on this theme. The man who dared, during the imbroglions of the last few years, to really speak out for peace, would have been a hero—if he had not been hung (in effigy) as a traitor. The nations have been sadly intoxicated with the war spirit of the last few years. Militarism is abroad with its deceiving but destroying togger. The protest of the churches against war is faint and feeble. As in regard to many other evils, it is more formal and sentimental than practical and potent. In an ill-defined theoretic sense we are opposed to war. But when the tocsin is sounded many Christians and ministers are among the earliest and most intense belligerents. Who can explain such an anomaly? Some of the secular magazines have recently published articles that justly denounced the low motives to war as well as its cruel barbarities. Why do our great Christian journals not do the same?

"But we do little better in times of peace when the advocacy of such a theme would not provoke discussion and seem to border on disloyalty. Even if it did seem disloyalty, that were better than criminal silence and surrender. We cannot at the peril of our souls approve the iniquities of the governments under which we live. We do little in times of peace in any direct way to instruct in the principles and foster the spirit of peace. If we do, it is so fragile that it is shattered at the first boom of a cannon.

"There are churches and prayer-meetings which were largely military barracks for months at a time during the quadrennium past. They were made to echo the latest reports of the press and the street. There was

unbrotherliness in the heart and the smell of powder in the air. How could the spirit of Christ dwell there? We have some ministers who are always ready to ride the hobby of the hour. If it happens to be a bloody war-steed it is just the same. The time has come for the church to exonerate itself in this regard. How? We must dethrone iniquity from office. We must be a more radical factor in public affairs. We must check the ambitions of national pride. We must protest against false policies. We must study public questions. We must know the dangers of war. We must study and cultivate the conditions of peace. We must exhaust every rational and Christian agency to avoid war.

"This subject is worthy a place in every schedule of the church. It should have a place with temperance and missions in the program of the pulpit, the Sunday school, the prayer-meeting and the Epworth League. Peace meetings should be common, and not anomalous things."

Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, member of the French Chamber of Deputies, who has been in this country as one of three commissioners investigating the matter of a site for the proposed French Industrial School, is one of the most prominent, large-minded and useful of present-day French statesmen. He was on the French deputation to the Hague Conference and is one of the four French members of the International Arbitration Court. During his stay in this country Mr. d'Estournelles gave several addresses on the results of the Hague Conference and the relations of the United States and France. At Chicago he delivered an address, by invitation, before the Union League Club, and also one at the university, where he spoke on the work of the Hague Conference. On the latter subject he spoke likewise at Columbia University, New York City, at a meeting presided over by Mayor Seth Low, who was one of the members with him of the Hague Conference. Arrangements were made for him to speak also at Harvard University under the auspices of the Cercle Français of the university and of the American Peace Society. But the severe storm prevailing at the time made it impossible for him to get to Boston from Montreal, and the meeting had to be given up, to the great regret of hundreds of persons who had planned to hear him. Baron d'Estournelles is deeply interested in the maintenance of the closest and most cordial relations between the United States and France. He declares that Providence has ordained them for close relationship, that "the two great republics were born to love each other," and that "they should go hand in hand down the pathway of time, radiating the highest type of civilization to all the rest of the globe." This close relationship must come about, he thinks, not so much through political action as through better general acquaintance, mutual understand-